The Fifth Amendment and the Labor Racketeer, P. 3

Exclusive: A New Line of Attack on the Un-American Committee and Its Blacklist, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 5 FEBRUARY 4, 1957 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Congress Moves More Slowly on Ike's New Blank Check

The President may be doing fine in Mecca, but he's having trouble in Washington. Two years ago, when he asked a blank check for war in the Far East, the House gave it to him next day. The Senate acted three days later. There were only three dissenting votes in each chamber. This year's request for a blank check to make war in the Middle East is having a stickier reception. Mr. Eisenhower made his request in extreme urgency on January 5, but when the House finally acted 25 days had passed and there were 61 votes in opposition. The Senate, less easily hurried, resumes public hearings this week. Our Conscript Fathers, by their dignified pace, show that we too are recovering from the cult of personality.

Actually the size of the opposition in the House is better measured by the vote last Tuesday to impose a gag on debate than by the vote next day on passage. The vote for the closed rule was 262 to 146. Many liberals like Celler (*D. N.Y.*), Reuss (*D. Wis.*) and Roosevelt (*D. Calif.*) were sharply critical but in the end felt compelled to vote for the joint resolution. As James Roosevelt said, "I cannot take the risk of having any vote I cast in this great body give aid and comfort to the designs of the Kremlin." What he really meant was that he could not risk having his vote misrepresented. Only the bolder liberals and the more stalwart isolationists stuck to their guns; Clare Hoffman (*R. Mich.*) and Chet Hollifield (*D. Calif.*), O'Konski (*R. Wis.*) and Multer (*D. N.Y.*) thus found themselves together.

The Real Weakness of the New "Doctrine"

A careful reading of the favorable report made by the House Foreign Affairs Committee indicates that even the submissive majority is acutely aware of the resolution's shortcomings. The report urges attention to the problems not covered by the resolution—the Arab-Israeli controversy, the resettlement of Arab refugees and the reopening of the Suez canal with adequate safeguards. The report also underscores, with soft discernment, the weakness of the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine. It says the nations of the Middle East "evaluate their own problems and the world situation in terms of their own individual circumstances. . . . Several of the Middle Eastern countries do not give a high priority to the Soviet threat. . . . All of these nations give top priority to national independence and freedom from foreign domination."

But neither in the bitter speeches of the House nor in the storm gathering in the Senate have there appeared men intrepid enough to translate this into plain English. It is the Middle Eastern desire for neutralism, with the threat that holds for U.S. bomber bases, which lies behind the crisis. If the forthcoming investigation looks for understanding rather than sensation, it will see that the trouble began when Egypt in October 1951 turned down our proposals for a Middle Eastern Command like NATO and SEATO.

A stable and neutral Middle East, in which legitimate oil and transit interests can be safe, is achievable. But $400,000,000 in *baksheesh* will not be enough to create a permanent protectorate. Congressman Hardy (*D. Va.*), fresh from his study of foreign aid follies in Iran (see page 4), told the House it was nonsense to talk of spending that amount for economic development in so short a time with no advance planning. He asked whether we were inviting Middle Eastern rulers "to believe that we stand ever more ready to solve our diplomatic problems simply by writing out more checks for the U.S. taxpayer." We are trying to buy the desert potentates when experience has shown, as Wayne Hays (*D. Ohio*) expressed it, that they can only be rented.

Best Not Translated Into Hungarian

Until we recognize that we cannot treat the area as a private preserve, the Russians will make trouble. The Russian opposition in the UN to an international police force to prevent a new outbreak between Egypt and Israel speaks self-righteously of "a dangerous precedent in the domestic affairs of sovereign states"—a mouthful which will read strangely when translated into Hungarian. Ever since Litvinov, every Soviet definition of aggression has included the formation of armed bands like Nasser's *fedayeen* on the territory of one state for incursions into another, but Moscow forgets when it comes to the Gaza strip. There it finds Israel "has absolutely no reason" to demand guarantees.

Congressional debate is having the useful byproduct of pushing the Administration reluctantly toward a policy more realistic than merely bidding against Moscow for Egyptian favor. Nasser is no Galahad of anti-colonialism. A key point was touched in the Senate last Tuesday by Douglas (*D. Ill.*). He asked Mansfield (*D. Mont.*) whether Egyptian reoccupation of Tiran at the entrance to Akaba would not block shipping access to "the alternative or supplementary pipeline being built from the head of the Gulf over to the Mediterranean and thus we shall have lost any alternative to Mr. Nasser's control over the Suez canal." Mansfield agreed and said the pipeline "is about one-third completed." It will run from Elath to Haifa, permitting oil for Western Europe to bypass Suez. Douglas went on to criticize Lodge's position at the UN, saying that once the Israeli withdraw and the Egyptian troops are back "the United Nations can pass whatever resolutions it wishes, but it will be faced with an accomplished fact . . . and the possibility of an alternative pipeline will be out of the question." Mansfield agreed that "the best possible solution" would be the Canadian proposal that UN troops move in as the Israeli troops move out. The difference is between appeasement of a dictator and a settlement fair to all.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Legislative History Cited Against The Effort to Identify and Blacklist Individuals

A New Line of Attack on the House Un-American Committee's Powers

As yet unnoticed by the press, a new line of attack on the House Un-American Activities Committee has been launched by Telford Taylor in a brief amicus filed with the U.S. Supreme Court in the Watkins case. Taylor has dug back into the legislative history of the resolution establishing the Committee in 1938. This is the gist of his argument:

"The legislative history of the statute and resolutions establishing the Committee . . . clearly shows that the Congressional purpose, in harmony with the wording, was to look into the origin, contents and channels of distribution of propaganda. Nothing in the legislative history supports the extraordinarily broad construction . . . that Congress has authorized the Committee to identify and 'expose' every present and former member of the Communist Party. A resolution (H. Res. 88, 75th Cong. 1st sess.) the language of which might have been susceptible to such interpretation was debated and rejected by the House of Representatives in 1937 shortly before Representative Martin Dies introduced the much narrower resolution (H. Res. 282, 76th Cong. 1st sess.) adopted by the House in 1938, the language of which is identical with that of the statute under which the Committee presently operates."

Started With "Nazi" Not "Un-American"

The language of the resolution establishing the Committee has an interesting history. Taylor shows that it is identical with that establishing the McCormack-Dickstein Committee in 1934, except that the latter used the word "Nazi" instead of "un-American." This was an investigation of Nazi propaganda activities and culminated in the passage of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

In 1937 Congressman Dickstein introduced a resolution calling for a broader investigation, no longer limited to propaganda but including "the character, objects, *extent of membership* and officers . . ." of organizations spreading "slanderous or libellous un-American propaganda of religious, racial, or subversive political prejudices. . . ." (Italics added).

Taylor asks the Court to notice that the Dickstein resolution "did not purport to embrace the membership of such organizations in years long past, and in that respect was perhaps less sweeping than the authority now claimed by the Committee." But it did "specifically envisage the 'identification' of all members of 'un-American propaganda' organizations."

Ham Fish Opposed This One

This new resolution ran into heavy opposition from two diverse sources. One was from the liberals in the House, led by Maury Maverick of Texas and Lindsay Warren of North Carolina, who were prophetic in their warnings. The other was from rightists not wholly unsympathetic with the Fascist and Nazi "shirt" groups mushrooming up around the country.

The foremost baiter of Reds, pinks, and liberals in Congress turned champion of civil liberties when confronted by this resolution. Hamilton Fish of New York had been the chairman of the prototype of the House Un-American Activities Committee, the committee set up in 1930 to investigate "communist propaganda in the United States and particularly in our educational institutions; the activities *and membership* of the Communist Party of the United States. . . ."

Ike's Judges and FDR's

Another hopeful straw in testing the judicial wind was the 6-3 decision by the Supreme Court ordering a new trial for Ben Gold (as predicted in our last issue) on the ground that there had been jury tampering. Politically this was a hot case, the first Taft-Hartley non-Communist oath prosecution on which the Court has ruled. Gold as leader of the Fur Workers was the foremost Communist in the trade union movement. In ruling that he had a right to a new trial, the three New Dealers left on the Court (Black, Frankfurter and Douglas) found themselves lined up with the three Eisenhower appointees (Warren, Harlan and Brennan) in Gold's favor. The dissenters were the two Truman judges (Burton and Clark) and FDR's one conservative appointee, Reed.

The jury tampering came about when a member of t panel from which petit jurors are chosen complained to the U.S. Attorney that she had received a copy of the Afro-American containing an advertisement attacking the Taft-Hartley Act inserted by another non-Communist oath defendant, Hugh Bryson. In the course of investigating, the FBI also questioned three members of the jury already sitting on the Gold case. The majority ruled the intrusion unintentional but said that did "not remove the effect of the intrusion."

Now, while the manager of the new resolution (Greenwood of Indiana) pleaded that it was not a question of freedom of speech but of investigating the organization and drilling of uniformed men in this country by Nazi German agents and funds, Fish reversed position. "This bill," he protested, "sets up an un-American checkup, nothing more or less, and restores the alien sedition (sic) laws. The American Legion would never be for that." The resolution lost 184 to 38.

Enter Martin Dies

It was after the defeat of the Dickstein resolution that Martin Dies of Texas introduced the narrower resolution, omitting reference to membership, which the House passed in 1938, establishing the Un-American Activities Committee.

The history is not new, but the use made of it is. Taylor is counsel for Robert M. Metcalf, a professor of art at Antioch College, summoned before the House Committee in September, 1954. He admitted that a decade earlier he was a member of a Marxist discussion group but declined to name other members. Trial of Metcalf for contempt has been held up, pending the Supreme Court's decision on the Watkins appeal. This is similar in that the UAW organizer also declined to name others he had known as Communists a decade before.

Taylor argues that the legislative history shows that the Un-American Activities Committee, unlike the old Ham Fish committee, was never intended to set out on a general inquiry to identify all Communists or Marxists, past and present.

Correction: Mr. Sydnor H. Walker, assistant to the President of Vassar, informs us that we were incorrect in reporting (our issue of Jan. 14) that Lloyd Barenblatt was discharged by the college as a result of his subpoena by the House Un-American Activities Committee. On investigating we find we were wrong and regret the unintentional reflection on Vassar.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Fifth Amendment and The Labor Racketeer

George Meany and the labor movement are to be applauded on their decision that any union official who invokes the Fifth amendment "for his personal protection and to avoid scrutiny by proper legislative committees . . . into corruption on his part . . . has no right to continue to hold office in his union." A properly constituted Congressional committee has lawful authority to investigate labor racketeering, and it is most encouraging that the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO should recognize that such committees "by reason of their power and authority to subpoena witnesses . . . have means beyond those of the labor movement to expose and bring to light corrupt influence." Gangsters have grown too strong for internal reform.

The abuse of the investigatory power by the Senate Internal Security Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee should not be allowed to blur the picture. These two committees invade an area which the First Amendment plainly closed to Congress. Those who invoke the Fifth as a last resort to avoid becoming informers in a latter day Inquisition can be defended without protecting racketeers violating the criminal laws with impunity in an area over which Congress has full authority. The Fifth amendment protects all men guilty or innocent from being forced to give testimony which may be used to prosecute them. But this does not mean that a trade union ought to keep in office a man who refuses to answer questions about the abuse of his trust. The trouble with the earlier position taken by the I.U.E., that such persons be put on trial by their unions, is that in some unions corruption is so powerful that the crooks would control the trial machinery. This is true of the Teamsters.

The Executive Council is to be commended also on avoiding the cheap demagogic temptation of coupling "communism and corruption." The former is a political problem to be handled by unions in a political way. The latter is a problem of law enforcement. By limiting its Fifth amendment position to inquiries into corruption, and by recalling the useful role played by Senate investigations in the past (like La Follette's before the war), the Executive Council has treated the issue with the seriousness and perspective which can best serve labor's cause.

Airpower: How We Don't Know That the Soviets Did Not Do It

The report on Airpower by the Symington subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee is in the tradition of the scare reports used by arms lobbies in Germany, France, England and the United States for half a century. Of the three Senators who signed the majority report, two, Symington of Missouri and Jackson of Washington, are from States in which the aviation industry is important; the third is Ervin of North Carolina. All three are Democrats, and their party appears here again as the party of the arms race. The dissenters are Republicans, Saltonstall of Massachusetts and Duff of Pennsylvania.

The majority report is a slapdash job. The subject is serious but all it does is pick out the most alarmist testimony it could find on every aspect of the subject and quote this with a minimum of analysis. Serious students should obtain the text for themselves and compare the treatment of the same material in the minority report. A striking sample is the majority's frightening emphasis on the grave danger of a surprise attack. This ignores testimony like that given by Admiral Burke which the minority cites:

Senator Duff. . . . Admiral, I was anxious to ask this question: Considering the rimming of the Soviet by the various bases that we have, together with the setup we have in England, Spain, France, around the Mediterranean, and with the deployment forward of part of your carrier force in the eastern area and in the Mediterranean, do you think it would be credible that the Soviet could organize an attack that would be a complete surprise everywhere?

Admiral Burke. I think it most unlikely, sir.

The kind of air forces a country should maintain depends on its own geographical position. There are as many types of planes as of weapons, and each has its own useful sphere of activity. The problem of achieving the best possible air force is not—as the Symington report would make one believe—a simple problem of outproducing every enemy in every type of plane. Eisenhower, as a soldier, understands this thoroughly and has expressed it several times but never clearly enough. This is a task of public education he had better tackle soon.

The most dangerous aspect of the report is its glib discussion of Soviet capacities. Historically arms lobbies have always exaggerated enemy power. But one has only to skim through works on the last war to see how poor air intelligence proved even in dealing with countries much smaller and more accessible than the Soviet Union.

Students of logic will be fascinated by the way the majority arrived at their conclusions. A sample is on page 50 which quotes an interrogation by Fowler Hamilton, the committee's counsel, of Lt. Gen. Donald L. Putt, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff, Development. Gen. Putt was asked whether he thought the Soviets had the capacity in 1950-52 to work on both the shorter range and the intercontinental missile. Gen. Putt thought they had.

Mr. Hamilton. So far as we know is there any reason to suppose that they did not do that? Do we have any intelligence that you know about of a positive character that indicates that they did not do that?

General Putt. I have no knowledge that they did not.

Our Air Force Heads Seem To Agree With That USIA Rebel

"Neither President Eisenhower nor any other American would think of letting atomic bases be planted in close proximity to us. We have no moral or inherent international right to plant them, thousands of miles from our shores, under the noses of other nations."

—Charles Edmondson's last protest as a USIA official, Tokyo, Jan. 27.

". . . all the information we get indicates that the Soviets are very much worried about this ring of bases of ours. . . . I often think that I would hate to see our country right today, the United States, rimmed with three or four hundred Russian bases in Canada and Mexico. It would be a pretty bad situation here."

—Air Force Chief of Staff Twining, quoted (p. 111) in the Symington committee report on Airpower, U.S. Senate, Jan. 30.

"It is a great comfort to me, as I am sure it is to you, that no potential enemy possesses a system of bases similarly located relative to the United States."

—Air Force Secretary Quarles, same report (p. 113).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Did U. S. Foreign Aid Funds Finance the Overthrow of Mossadegh in Iran?

The New Spy Arrests: A Question of Politics and Timing?

Nothing could be more valuable in counter espionage than to identify enemy agents. They can then be watched, their contacts noted, false information fed to them. To arrest them is to end these possibilities, and to put the foreign power on notice in the headlines to cover its tracks.

Against this background of normal counter espionage strategy, the new Soviet spy suspect arrests are puzzling. According to U.S. Attorney Paul Williams, the suspect Jacob Albam "replaced the second secretary of the Soviet Embassy, Vassily M. Zubilin, as a dominant figure in the espionage ring after World War II." Zubilin left this country in 1944 and Williams says this present case has been under FBI scrutiny for more than ten years. Yet so far the only charges are conspiracy to commit espionage and failure to register. Was it not possible in all that time to catch the suspects in the act?

I have heard reactionaries in Washington say that if the climate improves too much it is always possible to come up with a new Hiss case. The FBI and the Justice Department are acutely aware of the public relations angle. The arrests are being utilized—particularly in some very tendentious leads sent out by the Associated Press—to smear all refugees just when there is a chance that Congress might revise the Walter-McCarran Act to open our gates wider and to make life less difficult for aliens in this country. The new arrests deserve to be studied for their political effect and timing. As usual, too, they were accompanied by ballyhoo designed to convict the suspects in the press before they were even indicted, much less tried.

In the late Roman Empire, the path to the purple was often paved with bribes to the Pretorian Guards. The CIA once boasted that it overthrew Mossadegh in Iran (see the series in the *Saturday Evening Post,* Sept. 30 to Oct. 13, 1954). Now the new House Government Operations Committee Report on U.S. Aid Operations in Iran discloses (p. 47) that after Mossadegh was overthrown in 1953, a total of $1,700,000 in "bonuses" was paid the Iranian Army, gendarmerie and police out of U.S. "foreign aid" funds. A committee employe, asked if there was any connection between the palace revolt and the bonus, said that if there were it would have been censored out for security reasons. Though written under wraps, the report is a vivid picture of foreign aid abuses by native sharpies and the oil companies in a typical Middle Eastern country where—the committee reports—2 percent of the people own 70 percent of the land and literacy even in the cities has been estimated at no more than 7 percent. Part of the story is one of plain thievery and the Committee concludes that "if our foreign policy today in other lands is as entangled with economic aid operations of the kind described in this report, it is leaning on a poor kind of instrument indeed."

Moderate Estimate

"Paris—Senior NATO experts on civil defense are now working on the 'moderate' hypothesis that a hydrogen bomb attack on Britain would kill at least a million people outright. The NATO Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee has agreed on this as one of the basic assumptions it must make about thermonuclear war in the NATO area . . . the British casualty figure is based on a presumption of a certain amount of evacuation, provision of some shelters and a reasonable tactical warning."

—Sunday Times (London), Jan. 20.

The decision of Mayor Wagner not to greet Ibn Saud was foolish. When the President invites the head of another State to visit, certain elementary courtesies are called for. New York City has one of the great Jewish communities of the world, and it would have been more becoming for the Jewish leaders of New York to turn the other cheek, and to welcome the Arab monarch with a statement saying that they hoped his visit would be the forerunner of peace with Israel. This is not a visit from Adolf Hitler. It is a visit from the ruler of an Arab country who naturally feels as strongly in sympathy with the Arabs of Palestine as those of us who are Jews feel in sympathy with Israel. There has been a war, and there must be a peace. The President's gentle and thoughtful rebuke to the City of New York was justified.

Reprints of Last Week's "Meditations on Toscanini" Available Free on Request

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:
(To) Name .....
2/4/57

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED